4. The allegations set forth in Paragraph 4 of Plaintiffs' Complaint state legal conclusions to which no response is required. To the extent a response is deemed to be required, Defendant is without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations, and therefore denies the same.

5. In response to Paragraph 5 of Plaintiffs' Complaint, and based upon information and belief, Defendant admits that on or about September 17, 2005, Plaintiffs purchased a 2006 Toyota Avalon from Central Florida Toyota. TMS denies that it was the manufacturer of Plaintiffs' vehicle and denies that Central Florida Toyota, or any Toyota-authorized dealership, is an agent of TMS. Defendant is without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the remaining allegations set forth in Paragraph 5 of Plaintiffs' Complaint, and therefore denies the same.

6. In response to Paragraph 6 of Plaintiffs' Complaint, Defendant admits that a limited written warranty was provided with Plaintiffs' vehicle at the time it was initially purchased as a new vehicle and that the limited written warranty is a written instrument that speaks for itself. TMS denies that it was the manufacturer of Plaintiffs' vehicle. Defendant is without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the remaining allegations set forth in Paragraph 6 of Plaintiffs' Complaint, and therefore denies the same.

7. In response to Paragraph 7 of Plaintiffs' Complaint, Defendant denies that Central Florida Toyota or any other authorized dealership of TMS is an agent of TMS. TMS denies that it was the manufacturer of Plaintiffs' vehicle. Defendant is without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the remaining allegations set forth in Paragraph 7 of Plaintiffs' Complaint, and therefore denies the same.

TOY-TQ002-06-3D-00000189